Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
AUG 7 1975
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

October Term, 1975

No. 75-204

THOMAS B. DELASHAW, III,

Petitioner,

vs.

THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

ARTHUR W. FRANCIS, JR.
JONES & WILSON

5900 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90036
(213) 936-8216

Attorneys for Petitioner

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

October Term, 1975

No. _____

THOMAS B. DELASHAW, III,

Petitioner,

vs.

THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

ARTHUR W. FRANCIS, JR.
JONES & WILSON

5900 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90036
(213) 936-8216

Attorneys for Petitioner

TOPICAL INDEX

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION	2
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	2
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	3
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	8
I CERTIORARI SHOULD BE GRANTED TO REVIEW THE RULING OF THE COURT BELOW TO THE EFFECT THAT THE PRIVILEGE AGAINST SELF-INCRIMINATION AS GUARANTEED BY THE FIFTH AMENDMENT WAS NOT AVAILABLE TO PETITIONER IN A PRE-TRIAL CIVIL DISCOVERY PROCEEDING, SINCE IN SO HOLDING, THE COURT VIOLATED PETITIONER'S RIGHT TO EXECUTE HIS PRIVILEGE IN SUCH A PROCEEDING	8
II CERTIORARI SHOULD BE GRANTED TO REVIEW THE HOLDING OF THE COURT BELOW TO THE EFFECT THAT PETITIONER WAIVED HIS RIGHT AGAINST SELF-INCRIMINATION, SINCE IN SO HOLDING, THE COURT FAILED TO RECOGNIZE THAT ONE DOES NOT WAIVE THE PRIVILEGE	

		Page
	ONLY BY ADMITTING AN AFFILIATION WITH A PARTICULAR BUSINESS ENTITY	13
III	CERTIORARI SHOULD BE GRANTED TO REVIEW THE HOLDING OF THE COURT BELOW TO THE EFFECT THAT PETITIONER WAIVED HIS PRIVILEGE AGAINST SELF-INCRIMINATION, SINCE IN SO HOLDING, THE COURT FAILED TO RECOGNIZE THAT ONE DOES NOT WAIVE THE PRIVILEGE BY ANSWERING IN GOOD FAITH THOSE QUESTIONS WHICH SEEK NON-INCRIMINATORY INFORMATION	20
IV	CERTIORARI SHOULD BE GRANTED TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT PRIOR STATEMENTS MADE TO AN AGENT OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION BY A WITNESS AT A PRE-TRIAL CIVIL DISCOVERY PROCEEDING CONSTITUTE A WAIVER OF THE WITNESS' PRIVILEGE AGAINST SELF-INCRIMINATION	25
CONCLUSION		28
APPENDIX		
	Denial of Petition for Hearing in the California Supreme Court	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Page
Arndstein v. McCarthy, 254 U.S. 71 (1920)	14
Blau v. United States, 340 U.S. 159 (1950)	15
Brady v. United States, 397 U.S. 742 (1970)	14
Brown v. United States, 356 U.S. 148 (1958)	14-15, 18, 21
Counselman v. Hitchcock, 142 U.S. 547 (1892)	8
D. H. Overmyer Co. v. Frick Co., 405 U.S. 174 (1971)	14
Emspak v. United States, 349 U.S. 190 (1954)	16
Fuentes v. Shevin, 407 U.S. 67 (1972)	14
Grudin v. United States, 198 F.2d 610 (9th Cir. 1952)	17, 22
Healy v. James, 408 U.S. 169 (1972)	18
Hoffman v. United States, 341 U.S. 479 (1951)	11
Johnson v. Zerbst, 304 U.S. 458 (1938)	13, 14

Cases	Page
Kiewel v. United States, 204 F.ed 1 (8th Cir. 1953)	23, 24
Lefkowitz v. Turley, 414 U.S. 70 (1973)	8
In Re Levinson, 219 F. Supp. 589 (S.D.Cal. 1963)	22
Malloy v. Hogan, 378 U.S. 1 (1964)	8
McCarthy v. Arndstein, 266 U.S. 34 (1924)	8
Murphy v. Waterfront Commission of New York Harbor, 378 U.S. 52 (1964)	8
NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958)	18
Overend v. Superior Court, 131 Cal. 280 63 Pac. 372 (1900)	26
Rogers v. United States, 340 U.S. 367 (1951)	14, 15, 18, 21, 26
In Re Sales, 134 Cal.App. 54, 24 P.2d 916 (1933)	26
Shelton v. Tucker, 364 U.A. 479 (1960)	18

Cases	Page
Shendal v. United States, 312 F.2d 564 (9th Cir. 1963)	22
Smith v. United States, 337 U.S. 137 (1949)	15
Ullmann v. United States, 350 U.S. 422 (1955)	22
United States v. Miranti, 253 F.2d 135 (2nd Cir. 1958)	26

Constitution

United States Constitution:	
First Amendment	18
Fifth Amendment	2, 7-9, 12, 28

Statutes

California Code of Civil Procedure:	
§446	6
California Penal Code:	
§§ 118, 118a, 127, 133, 135, 153, 154, 155, 182, 470, 471, 475, 475a, 476, 476a, 484, 484b, 487, 492, 494, 496, 497, 503, 504b, 506, 506b, 507, 508, 529, 530, 531a, 532, 532a, 532c, 533, 536, 536a, 548, 560, 560.1, 560.2, 560.3	11
28 U.S.C. §1257(3)	2

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
October Term, 1975

No. _____

THOMAS B. DELASHAW, III,
Petitioner,

vs.

THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, FOR THE
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,
Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment herein of the California Supreme Court entered in the above-entitled case on May 8, 1975.

OPINION BELOW

Petitioner's request for review of the decision of the Superior Court of the

State of California, for the County of Los Angeles, was denied by the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, State of California, and by the California Supreme Court without benefit of a hearing. Both courts refused to review an order of the Superior Court compelling petitioner to answer certain questions orally and to produce certain documents. The order of the Superior Court is appended herein.

JURISDICTION

The dismissal of the petition for hearing by the California Supreme Court was entered on May 8, 1975. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. §1257(3).

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Does the Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination apply with full force to questions asked during pre-trial civil discovery proceeding?

2. Should a witness at a pre-trial civil discovery proceeding be deemed to have waived his privilege against

self-incrimination by admitting an affiliation with a particular business entity?

3. Should a witness at a pre-trial civil discovery proceeding be deemed to have waived his privilege against self-incrimination by answering in good faith questions which seek non-incriminatory information?

4. Do prior statements made to an agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation by a witness at a pre-trial civil discovery proceeding constitute a waiver of the witness' privilege against self-incrimination?

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Amendment V

"No person . . . shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself . . . ."

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

In a cross-complaint filed November 13, 1973, Real Party in Interest Home Savings and Loan Association seeks to

recover the principal sum of $300,000.00 plus interest and attorney's fees from Real Party in Interest Houston General Insurance Company by reason of a financial guaranty bond which it alleges was executed and delivered to it as partial security in connection with a real estate transaction in which it sold certain real property commonly known as the "Lido Apartment" to Real Party in Interest Marina West Insurance, Inc. for the sum of $1,200,000.00. Said obligation was evidenced by promissory notes in the sum of $900,000.00 and $300,000.00, secured by deeds of trust executed by Marina West Insurance, Inc. in favor of Home Savings and Loan Association and by the said financial guaranty bond. Houston General Insurance Company has denied any liability to Home Savings and Loan Association by reason of the said bond, and has asserted various affirmative defenses including that the purported bond was not executed by any authorized agent or employee of Houston, that the purported signature of Mr. James Schrader (Houston's underwriter) to the said bond is a forgery and that Home should be estopped

from recovering any judgment in the within action by reason of its alleged conspiracy with petitioner, Marina West Insurance, Inc. and Ralph Eidem to defraud Houston General Insurance Company by issuing or causing to be issued the said bond without the knowledge or consent of Houston General Insurance Company.

Houston General Insurance Company also filed a cross-complaint herein against petitioner and others seeking to have the bond cancelled; to recover damages for fraud; damages for the alleged negligence of James Schrader, and a judgment that Marina West Insurance, Inc. is in truth and in fact the alter ego of petitioner and Ralph Eidem. In answer to said cross-complaint, Home Savings and Loan Association alleges in part that if a fraud or conspiracy was committed it was a fraud and conspiracy committed by Marina West Insurance, Inc., petitioner, Ralph Eidem, James Schrader and others who had received actual and ostensible authority from Houston General Insurance Company and that accordingly any loss caused by the alleged fraud should therefore fall upon

Houston General Insurance Company.

In his verified answer to the verified cross-complaint filed herein as required by California Code of Civil Procedure §446, petitioner denies among other things that there was a fraudulent conspiracy to obtain the bond, denies concealing that the real property had been sold and repossessed on numerous occasions, denied concealing that the bond had been executed and delivered without the knowledge and consent of cross-complainant, denies concealing that cross-complainant received no security or other consideration for the bond, denies that the bond was fraudulently executed and delivered to Home Savings and Loan Association, and denies entering into a conspiracy to induce cross-defendant, James Schrader to breach his contract of employment with cross-complainant.

On or about April 9, 1974 and April 10, 1974, the deposition of petitioner was taken. During his deposition, petitioner answered all questions regarding background information and other

non-incriminating data and then refused to answer any questions regarding the Lido Apartments transaction, asserting his Fifth Amendment rights as the basis for his refusal to answer.

On May 17, 1974, Houston General Insurance Company moved the Superior Court for an order compelling petitioner to answer and to produce the documents. On July 19, 1974, after submission by counsel, Judge Goebel of the Superior Court granted the motion and ordered petitioner to answer all of the 191 questions propounded and produce the requested documents. Petitioner filed an application for stay and petition for alternative Writ of Mandate and/or Prohibition and/or Certiorari with the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, State of California, on or about February 20, 1974. The Court of Appeal summarily denied the petition on April 6, 1975, without hearing. Petition for Hearing in the California Supreme Court was filed on April 17, 1975, and summarily denied on May 8, 1975.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

I

CERTIORARI SHOULD BE GRANTED TO REVIEW THE RULING OF THE COURT BELOW TO THE EFFECT THAT THE PRIVILEGE AGAINST SELF-INCRIMINATION AS GUARANTEED BY THE FIFTH AMENDMENT WAS NOT AVAILABLE TO PETITIONER IN A PRE-TRIAL CIVIL DISCOVERY PROCEEDING, SINCE IN SO HOLDING, THE COURT VIOLATED PETITIONER'S RIGHT TO EXECUTE HIS PRIVILEGE IN SUCH A PROCEEDING

Past decisions of this Court have made it clear that the privilege against self-incrimination guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment extends broadly into civil law proceedings as well as criminal law proceedings. Counselman v. Hitchcock, 142 U.S. 547 (1892), McCarthy v. Arndstein, 266 U.S. 34 (1924), Lefkowitz v. Turley, 414 U.S. 70 (1973). In addition, since the Court's decision in Malloy v. Hogan, 378 U.S. 1 (1964), and its companion case of Murphy v. Waterfront Commission of New York Harbor, 378 U.S. 52 (1964), the applicability of the privilege in State proceedings has not

been questioned. Still, some courts have been reluctant to recognize the existence of the privilege in pre-trial civil discovery proceedings. The rationales offered for such decisions commonly are either that the witness in a civil proceeding has made an insufficient showing that his testimony will tend to be incriminating or that there is a likelihood of prosecution as a result of his testimony, or that the witness has waived his right to claim the privilege. The uneven application of the Fifth Amendment privilege in such cases begs a definitive statement from this Court as to the precise scope of the privilege.

In the case at bar, petitioner, during the taking of his deposition, invoked the Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination in response to 191 questions related generally to five subject area:

(1) Petitioner's personal financial transactions since January 1, 1972;

(2) The dates of the petitioner's involvement with Marina West

Insurance, Inc., since July 20, 1972;

(3) Petitioner's involvement with other business entities since July 20, 1972;

(4) Documents prepared by petitioner or possessed by him on certain occasions or at certain points in time;

(5) Petitioner's involvement in business deals with specific named individuals and business entities.

In his ruling of July 19, 1974, Judge Goebel of the Superior Court pursuant to motion ordered petitioner to answer each and every one of the 191 questions which he refused to answer during the course of his deposition. In all but 13 instances, Judge Goebel ruled that there was no privilege or that there was an insufficient showing of privilege by petitioner. Yet, it is apparent from the nature of each of the 191 questions asked that the information sought to be elicited from petitioner could form a "link in the

chain" of evidence which could "possibly tend to incriminate." Hoffman v. United States, 341 U.S. 479 (1951). When the questions standing alone are placed in the context in which they are asked, it is even clearer that his answers could possibly tend to incriminate him. The questions were posed by counsel for a cross-complainant which has alleged the commission of fraudulent acts. The fraudulent acts complained of, if true, could also be the subject of criminal prosecutions for violations of various state laws, to wit, California Penal Code §§ 118, 118a, 127, 133, 135, 153, 154, 155, 182, 470, 471, 475, 475a, 476, 476a, 484, 484b, 487, 492, 494, 496, 497, 503, 504b, 506, 506b, 507, 508, 529, 530, 531a, 532, 532a, 532c, 533, 536, 536a, 548, 560, 560.1, 560.2 and 560.3. Also, due to the interstate nature of the business transactions involved, there could be possible violations of various federal statutes, a statement supported by the fact that offices of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Internal Revenue Service in Los Angeles have been investigating petitioner's business transactions.

Petitioner submits that he has clearly demonstrated the existence of an incriminatory hazard and should the ruling of the Superior Court which denies his privilege against self-incrimination be allowed to stand in this instance, it will place petitioner in the impossible position of choosing either to testify and risk possible self-incrimination or to refuse to do so and suffer civil contempt. Refusal by this Court to correct this situation will leave petitioner with no other alternative, and will effectively strip him of his constitutional right as guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment.

Certiorari should be granted to resolve the conflicting applications of the privilege against self-incrimination by lower state and federal courts and to affirm that the privilege is available to witnesses in pre-trial civil discovery proceedings.

II

CERTIORARI SHOULD BE GRANTED TO REVIEW THE HOLDING OF THE COURT BELOW TO THE EFFECT THAT PETITIONER WAIVED HIS RIGHT AGAINST SELF-INCRIMINATION, SINCE IN SO HOLDING, THE COURT FAILED TO RECOGNIZE THAT ONE DOES NOT WAIVE THE PRIVILEGE ONLY BY ADMITTING AN AFFILIATION WITH A PARTICULAR BUSINESS ENTITY

In the 191 items involving assertions of the privilege against self-incrimination at his deposition, petitioner was found by the Superior Court to have waived the privilege in regard to eleven items and possibly two others. Of these, three items concern petitioner's refusal to answer questions concerning the date when he ceased to be affiliated with Marina West Insurance, Inc. as an officer and director. In ordering petitioner to answer the questions, the Superior Court offered the following reasons: "Not privileged; waived," and "Waived by previous answer."

The leading case establishing the standard for waiver is Johnson v. Zerbst, 304 U.S. 458 (1938). There, this Court

held that there must be an "intentional relinquishment or abandonment of a known right" before a waiver will be found (supra, at 464). The Johnson case required that three criteria be met in order for a waiver to be effective, namely that the waiver be voluntarily, intelligently and knowingly made. This standard has been reaffirmed and applied in recent decisions by this Court. See, e.g., Brady v. United States, 397 U.S. 742, 748 (1970), D. H. Overmyer Co. v. Frick Co., 405 U.S. 174, 187 (1971), and Fuentes v. Shevin, 407 U.S. 67, 94 (1972).

Application of the standard of waiver has been uneven. In Arndstein v. McCarthy, 254 U.S. 71 (1920) this Court seemed to require virtual admission of the elements of a crime before the privilege could be waived. Later, in Rogers v. United States, 340 U.S. 367 (1951) and Brown v. United States, 356 U.S. 148 (1958), this Court narrowed the restrictions on finding a waiver. Both cases involved a witness' admission of affiliation with the Communist Party, and could be interpreted to mean that a witness waives the

privilege with respect to the details of any facts about which he voluntarily testifies, if such facts are in themselves incriminatory.

Other cases, however, seem not to go as far as Rogers and Brown in certain respects. For example, in Smith v. United States, 337 U.S. 137 (1949), a witness was called to testify before an examiner of the Office of Price Administration concerning his alleged violations of price control regulations. Although the Emergency Price Control Act granted him immunity from prosecution for statements voluntarily made to the examiner, a federal court held that he had waived any claim to immunity by failing to assert it at the examination, even though he claimed the privilege against self-incrimination at that examination. The Supreme Court unanimously held that the witness obtained immunity by testifying and that he had not lost his privilege against self-incrimination, stating that waiver of the privilege "is not lightly to be inferred." Smith, supra, 337 U.S. 137 at 150. In Blau v. United States, 340 U.S. 159 (1950), the

Supreme Court unanimously held that a witness called to testify before a grand jury was entitled to claim the privilege against self-incrimination when asked questions concerning her membership in the Communist Party of Colorado. In Emspak v. United States, 349 U.S. 190 (1954), the Court held that a witness before a congressional committee had not, after making a general claim or privilege, waived the privilege as to a particular question by answering in the negative an inquiry as to whether his refusal to answer that question was based upon his belief that an answer would subject him to criminal prosecution. The Court, in Emspak concluded that waiver of the privilege could not be based upon vague, uncertain or equivocal evidence. The foregoing three cases each dealt with the manner in which the privilege was claimed by a witness, not with testimony by a witness which may be sufficiently incriminating to constitute a waiver. Nevertheless, the Court in each case expressed concern about whether a technical deficiency or momentary lapse could later be viewed as a waiver. This concern about

the consequences of a strict application of the waiver doctrine has been mirrored in lower federal court decisions.

In Grudin v. United States, 198 F.2d 610 (9th Cir. 1952), an admission by a defendant that he had written a non-incriminating letter relating to an automobile and to sending certain pink and white slips and to the expectation that he received a check, was held by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit not to constitute a waiver of his immunity from answering incriminating questions about later transactions involving the automobile or the pink and white slips or the check.

In the case at bar, although one cannot be certain what led the Superior Court to reach its conclusion with regard to the three items mentioned above, possibly the court felt that petitioner had waived the privilege in regard to the date of his termination from Marina West by testifying about the date of his affiliation with said corporation. This reasoning ignores the fact that affiliation with an organization is not per se incriminating

especially if no unlawful activities had allegedly occurred at that date. However, if unlawful activities occurred after that date, the date of termination may become "a link in a chain of facts" tending to incriminate, since affiliation with the corporation at the time certain alleged unlawful activities occurred may give rise to an inference that a director or officer had knowledge about or participated in such unlawful activities. To reach the conclusion that petitioner waived the privilege in this instance by testifying to the date of affiliation, the Superior Court was required to extend both Rogers, supra, and Brown, supra, beyond their confines. These two decisions mark the outer extreme on disclosure of affiliation with an organization, since to go further is to impinge on freedom of association guaranteed by the First Amendment. See NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449 (1958); Shelton v. Tucker, 364 U.S. 479 (1960); Healy v. James, 408 U.S. 169 (1972). Thus, while membership in the Communist Party may constitute a link in a chain of facts tending to incriminate, mere

affiliation with a lawfully-organized corporation can hardly constitute such a link. Thus, the admission of affiliation by petitioner with Marina West cannot by itself constitute a waiver of the privilege against self-incrimination.

As the reasons given by the Superior Court for its order indicate, the court was uncertain whether the answer to the question regarding the date of termination of petitioner from Marina West would have any tendency to incriminate. Given this uncertainty, the lower court could not reasonably conclude at the same time that petitioner waived the privilege by testifying about the date of his affiliation with Marina West. Since the date of his affiliation with Marina West was not in itself incriminating, petitioner could not properly invoke the privilege until asked about the date of his alleged termination from Marina West. Even then, the date of termination is not in itself an incriminating fact, but could be a possible link in the chain of facts tending to incriminate. If the privilege could not be relied upon prior to the

time that he was asked about the date of termination, it is impossible that petitioner could have waived the privilege by testifying at an earlier point about the date of his affiliation with Marina West. Under the circumstances, petitioner could not have been deemed to have waived his privilege against self-incriminating by admitting his affiliation with Marina West.

III

CERTIORARI SHOULD BE GRANTED TO REVIEW THE HOLDING OF THE COURT BELOW TO THE EFFECT THAT PETITIONER WAIVED HIS PRIVILEGE AGAINST SELF-INCRIMINATION, SINCE IN SO HOLDING, THE COURT FAILED TO RECOGNIZE THAT ONE DOES NOT WAIVE THE PRIVILEGE BY ANSWERING IN GOOD FAITH THOSE QUESTIONS WHICH SEEK NON-INCRIMINATORY INFORMATION

Of the 13 items of the deposition where the Superior Court found that the privilege had been waived, ten items involved questions which called for information concerning certain financial transactions in which petitioner had engaged, including repayment of personal loans, the obtaining of additional loans,

payments made from the Lido Account of Marina West Insurance, Inc., payment of funds from regular accounts of Marina West Insurance, Inc. for non-business-related purposes, and payments to cross-defendant James Schrader. In the case of each of these items, petitioner initially testified about obtaining loans in general or about making payments in general from established corporate accounts. Although the Superior Court did not specifically state its reasons for finding waivers in the case of these ten items, it may be that the court determined that petitioner's testimony concerning his practices and procedures in general constituted a waiver of the privilege where details of specific transactions were sought. Again, such reasoning reflects an interpretation of Rogers v. United States, supra, and Brown v. United States, supra, which is not supported by case law.

Although the court, rather than the witness, clearly has the last word in determining whether the privilege exists or whether it has been waived, courts have nevertheless tended to show great

deference to the claim of the witness. See, e.g., Ullman v. United States, 350 U.S. 422 (1955), Shendal v. United States, 312 F.2d 564 (9th Cir. 1963), In Re Levinson, 219 F. Supp. 589 (S.D. Cal. 1963). These cases accept as fundamental the fact that only the witness can know when testimony will incriminate or not incriminate him. If a witness is deemed to have waived the privilege each time he testifies about a non-incriminating set of facts, which is related to a subsequent incriminating set of facts, then the protection afforded by the privilege against self-incrimination is meaningless.

In most cases, courts have had a tendency to uphold the privilege rather than find a waiver where a witness testifies about part but not all of a transaction. (See, Grudin v. United States, supra.) In the instant case, as in Grudin, petitioner invoked the privilege on two items which dealt with repayment of loans by petitioner and his co-defendant Ralph Eidem. Although petitioner testified that he had received a loan to help finance the establishment of Marina West Insurance,

Inc. this fact was not incriminating, whereas the two items for which the privilege was invoked sought information concerning repayment of loans by petitioner and Ralph Eidem, which could possibly tend to incriminate petitioner. Similarly, petitioner testified that he had received a loan from his father, but asserted the privilege when asked about loans received from others during a specific time period. While the fact of the loan from his father was non-incriminating, the fact of the loan from others could possibly tend to incriminate him.

In Kiewel v. United States, 204 F.2d 1 (8th Cir. 1953), a corporation president was permitted to assert the privilege when asked by a Grand Jury about payments made to him by certain corporate accounts. In the instant case, petitioner asserted the privilege on items dealing with expenditures made by him involving the Lido Account. He also asserted the privilege when questioned concerning payments made from regular corporate accounts for non-business purposes. Finally, he claimed the privilege when asked whether Marina

West had ever issued a check to cross-defendant James Schrader. Petitioner testified at length concerning the general accounting system of Marina West Insurance, Inc., including his individual supervision of the operating, payroll and trust accounts. This testimony concerned non-incriminating facts, whereas the items in question sought information concerning the special Lido Account, expenditures for non-business-related purposes, and payments made to a single individual, all of which could possibly tend to incriminate petitioner. As in Kiewel, supra, petitioner should be permitted to refuse to answer questions concerning payments from corporate accounts which would tend to incriminate him. In making a good attempt to answer those questions which sought non-incriminating information, petitioner chose a point beyond which he felt he could not go without incriminating himself. The witness' decision should be respected and he should not be required to answer the questions referred to in the order of the Superior Court dated July 19, 1974.

Certiorari should be granted because the ruling of the Court below is in conflict with past decisions of this and lower Courts regarding waiver of the privilege against self-incrimination and has violated petitioner's right to invoke the privilege.

IV

CERTIORARI SHOULD BE GRANTED TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT PRIOR STATEMENTS MADE TO AN AGENT OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION BY A WITNESS AT A PRE-TRIAL CIVIL DISCOVERY PROCEEDING CONSTITUTE A WAIVER OF THE WITNESS' PRIVILEGE AGAINST SELF-INCRIMINATION

During the course of his deposition, petitioner testified that he had met with Mr. Holmes of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in May, 1973, at the Federal Building on Wilshire Boulevard, in Los Angeles. Petitioner refused to answer questions concerning the subject matter of his discussions with Mr. Holmes, including any conversations relating to the subject matter of the instant case. Although counsel for co-defendant and

cross-complainant Houston General Insurance Company argued at the time of the deposition that petitioner had waived the privilege with regard to these communications with Mr. Holmes, the Superior Court reasoned somehow that the communications were "not privileged." Although the court did not state that it based its reasoning upon a finding of waiver it may have reached such a result.

It is a universal rule that a waiver is effective only in the proceeding in which the person testifies. Hence, an individual may claim his privilege at a criminal trial after waiving it at the preliminary examination or before the Grand Jury. Overend v. Superior Court, 131 Cal. 280, 63 Pac. 372 (1900); In re Sales, 134 Cal.App. 54, 24 P.2d 916 (1933). At least one U.S. Circuit Court has held specifically that a defendant who voluntarily makes statements to an agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation does not waive the privilege against self-incrimination when called to testify before a Grand Jury. United States v. Miranti, 253 F.2d 135 (2nd Cir. 1958).

It is submitted that any statements made to Mr. Holmes, do not constitute a waiver of the privilege against self-incrimination in a later deposition in a civil case. The only issue to be resolved therefore is whether petitioner had reason to invoke the privilege with respect to those conversations. As indicated supra, those conversations, if divulged, could reveal facts which could form "a link in a chain of facts" tending to incriminate petitioner. Thus, assertion of the privilege with regard to those conversations was clearly appropriate under the circumstances, contrary to the reasons set forth by the Superior Court for its order. Similarly, the privilege could not be waived by the mere revealing of the occurrence of conversations which took place during a prior proceeding.

This Court should grant certiorari to settle the issue of whether or not prior statements made to an agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation by a witness in a civil proceeding constitute a waiver of the witness' privilege against self-incrimination.

CONCLUSION

Petitioner, for the reasons aforesaid, has been denied his Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination. He has been unable to present his case at hearing in the Appellate Courts of California. He finds himself accordingly in the impossible position of having lost his constitutional guarantees and choosing either to testify and possibly incriminate himself or not to testify and suffer civil contempt. It is respectfully prayed that a writ of certiorari be granted to review the judgment of the Courts below.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTHUR W. FRANCIS, JR.
JONES & WILSON

Attorneys for Petitioner

APPENDIX

CLERK'S OFFICE, SUPREME COURT
4250 STATE BUILDING

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102

MAY 8 - 1975

I have this day filed Order

HEARING DENIED

In re: 2 Civ. *No.* 45829

Delashaw

vs.

Superior Court, Los Angeles

Respectfully,

G. E. BISHEL
Clerk

81414-877 2-74 SM OSP

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
AUG 7 1975
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

October Term, 1975

NO. 75-204

THOMAS B. DELASHAW, III,

Petitioner,

vs.

THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,

Respondent.

APPENDICES 2 and 3

to

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

ARTHUR W. FRANCIS, JR.
JONES & WILSON

5900 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90036
(213) 936-8216

Attorneys for Petitioner

APPENDIX 2

L.A.S.C. Case No. C 66037

Ruling of Judge August J. Goebel

C 66037

Home Savings and Loan Association
vs.
Houston General Insurance Company

Counsel for Plaintiff	Thomas B. Delashaw in Pro Per A Francis for plff Delashaw in a companion action J Roger Gelsinger for plff Home Savings and Loan Assn Miller & Clearwater by: Steven E. Trabish for J A Schrader X-deft
Counsel for Deft	Monteleone & McCrory by Alan Ribakoff for Houston Genl Ins

---

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS.

NOTICE OF RULING RE MOTION OF DEFENDANT, HOUSTON GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY, FOR ORDER COMPELLING THOMAS H DELASHAW III TO ANSWER CERTAIN QUESTIONS ORALLY AND TO COMPEL THOMAS B. DELASHAW III TO PRODUCE DOCUMENTS AND FOR REASONABLE EXPENSES AND ATTORNEY'S FEES

The above entitled motion of defendant having heretofore been taken under submission, the Honorable August J. Goebel, Judge presiding in Department 88, now makes and announces the following ruling thereon pursuant to oral agreement of counsel and the court's order of May 1, 1974.

Cont to 3A

July 19, 1974 Dept., 88

C 60037

Home Savings and Loan Association
vs.
Houston General Insurance Company

As to the motion to compel answer to certain questions, the items hereinafter referred to are the same numbered items more specifically described by page and line number in the Declaration of Notary Public, Robert V. Reijas, filed on May 14, 1974, as a part of defendant's Notice of Motion. Said motion is granted as indicated and on the specified grounds and the plaintiff, Thomas B Delashaw III is ordered to answer all of the items

ITEM NO.		REASON
1	Answer	No privilege, and if privileged, waived
2	Answer	Waived
3	Answer	No privilege; assented by witness
4, 5, 6, 7 & 8	Answer	Not privileged
9 & 10	Answer	Not privileged; waived
11	Answer	Not privileged
12	Answer	No showing why privileged
14	Answer	Not sufficient privilege
13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25	Answer	Not sufficient showing why privileged

Cont to 3B

July 19, 1974 (3A)

Dept.,
88

C 66037

Home Savings and Loan Association
vs
Houston General Insurance Company

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS

ITEM NO.		REASON
26 and 27	Answer	Waived by previous answer
28 and 29	Answer	Not sufficient showing of privilege
30 and 31	Answer	No Privilege
32 through 57, inclusive and 55 through 75, inclusive	Answer	Not sufficient showing of privilege
58	Answer	No privilege
76 through 82, inclusive	Answer	Privilege waived by other answers
83 and 84	Answer	No privilege
85 and 86	Answer	Not sufficient showing of privilege
87 and 88	Answer	No privilege
89 and 90	Answer	Not sufficient showing of privilege
91 through 94, inclusive	Answer	No privilege

Cont to 3C

July 19, 1974 (3B)

Dept.,
88

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS

ITEM NO.		
95 through 112, inclusive, and 114 through 127, inclusive	Answer	Not sufficient showing of privilege
113	Answer	Not privileged
128 and 139 through 141, inclusive	Answer	No privilege
142 through 147, inclusive	Answer	Not sufficient showing of privilege
148 through 154, inclusive	Answer	No privilege
155 and 157 through 159, inclusive	Answer	Not sufficient showing of privilege
156, 160, 161 and 163	Answer	No privilege
162 and 164 through 167, inclusive, and 169 through 173, inclusive	Answer	Not sufficient showing of privilege

Cont to 3D July 19, 1974 (3C) Dept. 88

ITEM NO.		REASON
168 and 174	Answer	No privilege
175 through 179, inclusive and 181 through 191, inclusive	Answer	Not sufficient showing of privilege
180	Answer	No privilege

That at the time of giving his answers as above specified, the plaintiff, Thomas B. Delashaw III is ordered to produce the following documents:

(1) Account statements on any account of Thomas Delashaw with Imperial Bank during the last five (5) years. (Item 9 of the Subpoena Duces Tecum);

(2) Cancelled checks on any checking account held by Thomas Delashaw in the last five (5) years. (Item 10 of the Subpoena Duces Tecum)

(3) Bank books on any savings or trust account of Thomas Delashaw in the last five (5) years. (Item 11 of the Subpoena Duces Tecum);

(4) Any financial statement prepared for Thomas Delashaw in the last five (5) years (Item 12 of the Subpoena Duces Tecum);

(5) Checking account books and/or savings account books of Thomas B. Delashaw

Cont to 3E July 19, 1974 (3D) Dept. 88

with any banking or lending institution in any American State or in any country of the world, including any unnumbered account held by him in Switzerland or Lebanon or any other country. (Item 15 of the Subpoena Duces Tecum).

The witness, Thomas B. Delashaw, III, is ordered to appear for the taking of his deposition as herein specified at the offices of Monteleone and McCrory, 5900 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2900, Los Angeles, California, on such date and at such hour as the parties may mutually agree. Otherwise, the Court will make its order as to the date of the deposition.

The motion for expenses and attorney's fees is denied.

That a copy of this order is served this date upon counsel of record by depositing true copies of the within enclosed in sealed envelopes with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States Post Office mail box at 111 North Hill Street, Los Angeles, California, addressed as follows:

Thomas B. Delashaw, Esq.
14013 West Old Harbor Ln.
Marina del Rey, CA 90291

Steven E. Trabish, Esq.
4676 Admiralty Way, Ste 701
Marina del Rey, CA 90291

Dept. 88

July 19, 1974 (3E)

C 66037

Home Savings and Loan Association
vs
Houston General Insurance Co.

NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS

J Roger Gelsinger, Esq.
3731 Wilshire Blvd., 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90010

Monteleone & McCrory
Mutual Benefit Life Bldg. Ste 2900
5900 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90036

July 19, 1974 (3F) Dept. 88

APPENDIX 3

Court of Appeal, Second District

Case No. 45829

DENIAL of Application for stay and petition for alternative writ of mandate and/or prohibition and/or certiorari.

POST CARD

CLERK'S OFFICE
Court of Appeal
SECOND DISTRICT
3580 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SUITE 301
LOS ANGELES, CA 90010

620-5377

LOS ANGELES APR 2 '75 CALIF

EIGHT CENT STAMP HERE

Jones & Wilson

1430 Mutual Benefit Life Plaza
5900 Wilshire blvd.
Los Angeles, California

Los Angeles, Cal. , 19

TITLE { THOMAS B. DELASHAW III
vs.
S.C.L.A. } No. 45829

The Court

Application for stay and petition for alternative writ of mandate and/or prohibition and/ or certiorari denied.

April 2-75

Dist. Admin

CLAY ROBBINS, Clerk

Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
SEP 5 1975
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1975
No. 75-204

THOMAS B. DELASHAW, III,

Petitioner,

vs.

THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,

Respondent.

HOUSTON GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY, etc., *et al.*,

Respondents.

RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI.

GEORGE ROBERT HALE,
ALAN P. RIBAKOFF,
5900 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2900,
Los Angeles, Calif. 90036,
(213) 937-1533,
Attorneys for Respondent Houston General Insurance Company.

MONTELEONE & MCCRORY,
Of Counsel.

Parker & Son, Inc., Law Printers, Los Angeles. Phone 724-6622

SUBJECT INDEX

	Page
Questions Presented	1
Statement of the Case	2
Argument	5
Conclusion	8
Appendix. California Evidence Code, Section 404	App. p. 1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

Cases	Page
Brown v. United States, 356 U.S. 148, 2 L.Ed.2d 589, 78 Sup.Ct. 622 (1958)	7
Brown v. Walker, 161 U.S. 591, 40 L.Ed. 819, 16 Sup.Ct. 644 (1896)	7
Cohen v. Superior Court, 173 Cal.App.2d 61, 343 P.2d 135 (1959)	5
Hoffman v. United States, 341 U.S. 479, 95 L.Ed. 1118, 71 Sup.Ct. 814 (1950)	5
Overend v. Superior Court, 131 Cal. 280, 63 Pac. 372 (1900)	5
People v. Freshour, 55 Cal. 375 (1880)	7
Rogers v. United States, 340 U.S. 367, 95 L.Ed. 344, 71 Sup.Ct. 438 (1950)	5, 7
The Regents of the University of California v. Superior Court, 200 Cal.App.2d 787, 19 Cal.Rptr. 568 (1962)	7
Statutes	
California Evidence Code, Sec. 404	5
United States Constitution, Fifth Amendment	3, 4, 6

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1975
No. 75-204

THOMAS B. DELASHAW, III,

Petitioner,

vs.

THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,

Respondent.

RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI.

Questions Presented.

The court below considered each question to which the privilege against self-incrimination was claimed, and ruled separately on the various questions that Petitioner had either failed to make a sufficient showing that the privilege attached, or that there was no privilege, or that Petitioner had waived his right to claim the privilege.

The questions presented for review by Petitioner in his petition are based solely upon supposition and do not reasonably relate to the rulings made by the Superior Court. Contrary to Petitioner's contentions, the court below did not rule that the privilege against self-incrimination was not available in a pre-trial civil discovery proceeding; nor did the court hold that Peti-

tioner waived his privilege by testifying to unrelated, non-incriminatory information.

The questions which were presented to the Superior Court were simply:

1. Did Petitioner make a sufficient showing that the privilege against self-incrimination was applicable, that is, that the information sought might possibly tend to incriminate him; and

2. If applicable, did Petitioner waive the privilege by testifying to other, closely related facts?

Respondent submits that the lower court's resolution of these factual questions, which resulted in a rejection of the claim of privilege by Petitioner, was in accordance with applicable decisions of this court.

Statement of the Case.

The subject lawsuit was commenced by one Home Savings and Loan Association (herein "HOME") to recover the principal sum of $300,000.00 from Respondent Houston General Insurance Company (herein "HOUSTON") by reason of a financial guaranty bond allegedly issued by Houston, as surety, on behalf of one Marina West Insurance, Inc. (herein "MARINA WEST"). Said bond was given to Home as security for payment of a portion of the purchase price of certain improved real property known as the "Lido Apartments" sold by Home to Marina West. Marina West later defaulted in the payment of the purchase price and the subject lawsuit followed.

Petitioner, as an officer of Marina West, is believed to be the person who participated in said real estate transaction and in the procurement of said bond on behalf of Marina West.

In answer to the Complaint, Houston asserted, as alternative defenses, the possibilities that the bond was a forgery, or that it was procured by fraud with the knowledge of Home, or that Home failed to disclose to Houston certain facts concerning the real property transaction which would affect the risk undertaken by the surety.

Houston also filed a Cross-Complaint against Petitioner and others for indemnification in the event Houston is found to be liable to Home. A money judgment is sought from Petitioner on the alternate grounds that he was an *alter ego* of Marina West, the principal on said bond, or that he had participated in the alleged fraudulent procurement of said bond.

As part of its pre-trial discovery in the subject civil action, Houston took the deposition of Petitioner to ascertain information concerning said real estate transaction and the circumstances under which said financial guaranty bond was issued. During his deposition, Petitioner refused to answer any questions concerning the subject matter of said real estate transaction or said bond procurement, basing his refusal to answer some 190 questions on the ground of the Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination.

Due to its inability to obtain answers from Petitioner to any questions concerning the subject matter of the pending lawsuit, Houston is gravely handicapped and prejudiced in its preparation of a defense to the subject action, which requires information concerning the circumstances under which the financial guaranty bond was procured and information concerning the negotiations and dealings between Petitioner and others with Home on the real estate transaction. Accordingly, Hous-

ton brought a motion to compel answers to its deposition questions, contending that Petitioner failed to sufficiently establish that the Fifth Amendment privilege applied, or, if it did, that Petitioner had waived the privilege.

The Honorable August J. Goebel, Judge of Respondent Superior Court of the State of California, after reviewing the deposition and considering the legal briefs submitted in favor of and against said motion, ordered Petitioner to answer the questions propounded to him at the deposition, ruling on varying questions that Petitioner had either failed to establish that the privilege was applicable or that the privilege was waived.

Thereafter, Petitioner filed with the Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, State of California, an Application for Stay and Petition for Alternative Writ of Mandate and/or Prohibition and/or Certiorari for the purpose of nullifying the lower court's order, contending that said court had violated Petitioner's privilege against self-incrimination as afforded by the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

The Court of Appeal summarily denied said petition for extraordinary relief on April 8, 1975. A subsequent petition for hearing in the California Supreme Court was summarily denied on May 8, 1975.

ARGUMENT.

On the majority of the questions presented below, the Superior Court ruled that Petitioner did not sustain his burden of showing that the privilege attached, *i.e.*, that his testimony might have tended to incriminate him.

Whenever a claim of privilege against self-incrimination is asserted, it is well settled that the court must determine whether or not the answer to a particular question would subject the witness to a danger of incrimination. The mere assertion of the privilege does not of itself automatically establish the hazard of incrimination. *Rogers v. United States,* 340 U.S. 367 (1950); *Overend v. Superior Court,* 131 Cal. 280 (1900). Furthermore, the witness has the burden of showing that the information sought might tend to incriminate him. Section 404, *California Evidence Code.*

In making its determination of whether or not the answer called for by a question could form a necessary link in a chain of evidence leading to conviction of a crime, the court must consider all of the surrounding circumstances, including the setting in which the questions were asked. *Overend v. Superior Court, supra; Cohen v. Superior Court,* 173 Cal.App.2d 61 (1959).

In the light of the foregoing established authority and the circumstances present in the subject action, Houston submits that the lower court properly ruled that the privilege did not attach in this case, for the following reasons:

1. The questions asked do not, on their face, seek answers which would be incriminating *per se.*

2. The setting in which the questions were asked is unlike *Hoffman v. United States,* 341 U.S. 479 and

related cases where the proceedings involved legislative crime investigations or grand jury hearings. This is a private, civil proceeding whereby Houston seeks to recover indemnification from Petitioner and others by way of money damages, and the deposition sought information to enable Houston to prepare and prove its civil case. The object of the deposition proceeding was not to charge nor accuse Petitioner with the commission of a crime, if any existed.

3. The only showing whatsoever made on behalf of the Petitioner concerning the alleged incriminatory nature of the deposition inquiry was by Petitioner's present counsel, Mr. Francis, who stated that he was aware of criminal investigations against Petitioner at that time or that had been conducted by agencies such as the FBI, the IRS and the Los Angeles County District Attorney's office that *can* or do have reference to the transactions involved in this action. Yet, Petitioner testified that he had never communicated with representatives of the IRS nor the Los Angeles District Attorney's office and, when questioned about whether he discussed the matters involved in the subject action with the FBI, he refused to answer, asserting the Fifth Amendment privilege.

4. Considering all of the evidence presented to the lower court and the surrounding circumstances, the answers sought by the questions asked could not possibly tend to incriminate Petitioner of some crime. The challenged questions merely sought information concerning the purchase of real estate and the furnishing of a bond to guaranty a loan with respect thereto, which subjects are the factual matter in issue in this civil lawsuit.

On eleven of the questions, and possibly two others, the Superior Court ruled that Petitioner had waived his right to the privilege by prior testimony of closely related factual information.

Past decisions of this court as well as state court decisions have made it clear that the privilege against self-incrimination may be waived with respect to inquiry into closely connected facts if the witness has voluntarily disclosed a portion of those facts. *Rogers v. United States, supra; Brown v. United States*, 356 U.S. 148 (1958); *Brown v. Walker*, 161 U.S. 591 (1896); *The Regents of the University of California v. Superior Court*, 200 Cal.App.2d 787 (1962); *People v. Freshour*, 55 Cal. 375 (1880).

Petitioner suggests as a rationale for upholding the privilege that the areas of actual testimony were not incriminating, while the areas in which the privilege was asserted may provide "a link in the chain of facts" tending to incriminate, and relies on subtle distinctions between the two areas. It is submitted that any question has the potential for seeking incriminating information, and the criteria for determination of waiver cannot be based on such suggested possibilities of incrimination, else the privilege becomes solely the province of the witness free from all judicial scrutiny.

It is obvious that after having reviewed the nature of the questions in the light of the testimony elicited from the Petitioner that the Superior Court found that Petitioner had waived his right to assert the privilege with respect to closely connected facts.

Conclusion.

The lower court's ruling does not depart from any established legal principles nor conflict with any decisions of this Supreme Court or other federal courts. What the lower court decided, after considering all of the evidence and circumstances, was simply that Petitioner had failed to show that the information sought by the deposition questions might possibly have tended to incriminate him of some crime and, in some instances, that Petitioner had waived the privilege by prior testimony. The decision hardly presents such novel questions of law as to merit the consideration of the Supreme Court.

Accordingly, Respondent Houston respectfully requests that the subject Petition for Writ of Certiorari be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

GEORGE ROBERT HALE,
ALAN P. RIBAKOFF,

Attorneys for Respondent Houston General Insurance Company.

MONTELEONE & MCCRORY,
Of Counsel.

APPENDIX.

California Evidence Code Section 404.

§404. *Determination of whether proffered evidence is incriminatory.* Whenever the proffered evidence is claimed to be privileged under Section 940, the person claiming the privilege has the burden of showing that the proffered evidence might tend to incriminate him; and the proffered evidence is inadmissible unless it clearly appears to the court that the proffered evidence cannot possibly have a tendency to incriminate the person claiming the privilege. (Stats. 1965, c. 299, §404.)